

Morley v. the CIA, Part 2

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=s1ecxFsP2HA> (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=s1ecxFsP2HA>)

Uploaded by [The Future of Freedom Foundation](#)
(<https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCqOG4zIDmbIUK12Fzwg5tLA>) on Sat May 01 2021.

This is the story of my lawsuit seeking certain JFK records. The ebook is both a historical investigation of CIA psychological warfare operation (AMSPELL) involving Oswald in 1963 and legal story about how the CIA uses the FOIA to thwart full disclosure around the assassination in 2021, with the blessing of the courts. In my presentation, I'll talk about how the lawsuit came about: the remarkable role of Jim Lesar, an affidavit from Judge Tunheim, the testimony of Dan Hardway, an interview with AMSPELL agent Jose Antonio Lanuza, and the opinion of Judge Karen Henderson. I'll also talk about how to finish the JFK investigation in 2021.

[00:00:00](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=s1ecxFsP2HA) (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=s1ecxFsP2HA>)

[Music] all right well we'll get started now at 7 00 p.m i'm jacob hornberger i'm president of the future of freedom foundation the sponsor of this conference called the national security state and the kennedy assassination welcome back to our previous conference attendees and welcome to anybody joining us for the first time as most of you know the future of freedom foundation is a libertarian educational foundation and our mission for over 30 years now has been to present the principal case for the free society and part of that mission involves a focus on the national security state we have long held that an essential prerequisite for achieving a libertarian society is a limited government republic and i personally believe that the biggest mistake in american history was the conversion of the federal government to a national security state and we'll be examining facets of that national security state in this conference we already have and we'll continue to do that now before i introduce our speaker tonight let me talk about a couple of things again the the old-timers of this conference know the procedure there will be a chat button where you all can chat amongst yourselves and then there's the q a button if you want to ask a speak speaker a question or the speaker a question then use the q a button because i won't be looking at the chat button for for questions and again please revolve your question around jeff's talk tonight or even the previous talk last week would be fine as well now before i introduce jeff again let me tell you about what we're going to be doing next week now next week we move into the medical evidence portion of this conference which is critically important and the speaker who's going to be leading it off is doug horn who served on the assassination records review board staff in the 1990s and wrote the watershed five volume book inside the assassination

[00:02:00](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=s1ecxFsP2HA&t=120s) (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=s1ecxFsP2HA&t=120s>)

inside the assassination records review board jeff has done a fantastic presentation he's recorded the presentation it's two hours and 40 minutes long so obviously we felt that if if we do that next wednesday if we present that to you there's going to be no no room for q a uh but it it's such a fantastic uh presentation that we didn't want to ask doug to shorten it or do it i mean he spent you'll see he spent so much time and effort putting this thing together that we wanted to present it to you in complete format so what we're doing something different then since we're doing these online zoom meetings we have some flexibility we have already posted that video online it's on our website at fff.org you have homework as part of being a registered to this seminar we're assigning you homework there won't be any pop quizzes but your homework is to watch this video before next wednesday's presentation and then next wednesday's presentation is going to be devoted to q a uh so that's your homework watch the video over the next 10 days or so you can divide it up into segments one hour segments or whatever but please try to do that so that the questions will then revolve around the talk itself during the q a okay we'll move to our speaker now jefferson morley i already

introduced him last week this is part two of his presentation morley versus cia my unfinished jfk investigation uh last week he delivered a fascinating talk on revelations that he recognizes has happened in the last several years in the research community among in in the kennedy assassination let me reintroduce him he is a former investigative reporter for the washington post he worked there for about 15 years he's been widely published in a number

00:04:00 (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=s1ecxFsP2HA&t=240s>)

he's been widely published in a number of publications including the intercept the new york review of books the nation the new republic salon slate just security and others he is the co-editor of a great website called deepstateblog.org i go to it every day as well as the founder and editor of jfkfax.org which is another great website about the assassination of president kennedy i go to that regularly as well he's an author uh the author of a book called the ghost which is a biography of james jesus angleton the the legendary cia counterintelligence chief also the author of our man in mexico which is a biography of when scott who was the cia's chief spy in the 1960s in mexico city he's also the author of a book called snowstorm in august that tells the story of a riot in washington dc in the early 1800s and we're pleased to say he's the author of two books that the future of freedom foundation has published relating to the kennedy assassination one is cia and jfk the secret assassination files and the other is what he's going to be talking about tonight morley versus cia my unfinished jfk investigation in fact it's it's with this particular case that he's going to be talking about tonight that i discovered jefferson morelia i read a series of articles that he wrote about this particular case and i was absolutely fascinated by it and so i wrote a series of articles like reviews of what he had uncovered because i considered it so significant then he discovered that i'd written this this series and contacted me and we've been good friends ever since and this is actually the second jfk conference that he has spoken at that fff has sponsored so without any further ado let me present to you again jefferson morley jeff welcome back thank you for having me jacob thanks for

00:06:00 (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=s1ecxFsP2HA&t=360s>)

thank you for having me jacob thanks for that nice introduction so um i don't know if everybody saw my presentation last week it was more kind of looking backwards um uh looking at what what have we learned in recent years in the past 20 years about the jfk story and i ran through the things that had been some of the things that had been most influential and struck me as both new and highly significant um and these range from the number of people of political insiders like jackie kennedy and bobby kennedy and lyndon johnson and foreign leaders like fidel castro and charles de gaulle how many of them believed that the president had been killed by his enemies and rejected the official story at least privately that's a very significant finding in the medical evidence which you'll hear more from from um from doug horn uh i'm no expert in that but the the testimony of dr robert mcclellan the doctor who tried to save kennedy's life and where he thought that the gunfire had come from very significant uh uh evidence for me doug horn will also talk another piece of significant medical evidence the testimony of sandra spencer a photographic technician involved in developing the photographs of the president's autopsy and what she said in her deposition to the assassination records review board and then some of the some of the better known uh revelations of recent years the the disclosure of a new air force one tape the tape of communications with air force one on the afternoon of nov and evening of november 22nd and what they showed the disclosure of operation north woods the pentagon false flag operation to provoke a war with cuba by staging a crime in the united states and blaming it on the cuban government um something that was not disclosed to any jfk investigation that's highly significant um and then and then finally um uh not one particular revelation but a

00:08:00 (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=s1ecxFsP2HA&t=480s>)

uh not one particular revelation but a body of of records which is really the the most complete and declassified version of the lee harvey oswald file that we that we obtained uh in the final disclosures of the jfk review board and we could see that the story that the pres that this man was who allegedly killed the president was unknown essentially unknown to the u.s government was is really false and and deliberately

falls and and we know now and it's quite clear it's really indisputable oswald was of interest to senior cia operations officers on the eve of the assassination and the uh and the cia took care to conceal this from the uh from the investigations and we only it was only in 2000 that we finally had some of these documents declassified in their entirety and we could see all the cia officers who were knowledgeable about oswald before the assassination so that's really the big body of records and the most important things that that i came across and then in my own personal efforts was one more thing um which was a a kind of narrower point of view on on the cia's knowledge of oswald and that is that oswald in the last days of his life was the target of a cia propaganda operation which was known by the code name of amspel an amspel was the code name was the agency's code name for a group called the directorio revolucionario estudiantil in english it was usually referred to as the cuban student directorate these were uh the students who were opposed to the cuban government's turn towards communism after the revolution of 1959. um mostly from the university of havana not only um these were middle class nationalistic students opposed to the left-wing government that fidel castro was imposing and they were eventually forced

00:10:01 (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=s1ecxFsP2HA&t=601s>)

imposing and they were eventually forced out of cuba by government repression and went to miami where they became funded by the cia and amspel was the code name that the agency gave to them so what we learned in recent years was that this or this entity the cia program m spell uh was instrumental in publicizing oswald's procastro activities both before and after the assassination this was not disclosed to the uh to the warren commission for example the warren commission when they described oswald's contacts with the cuban student directorate in new orleans in august of 1963 only said a cuban uh exile organization they didn't give the name of the organization because they wanted to hide i believe they wanted to hide the fact that it was the cia that was funding this organization and what we learned in in the last 20 years was just how much they were funding this organization 51 000 a month for these college students um to run a big organization to be sure they had a lot of support in in miami and also around latin america and around the country in cities like new orleans and dallas for that matter um so they had a big organization um which was entirely supported by the cia and that's something new that we learned but the the part where i really got interested is when the first documents came out about this amspel operation in the 1990s i noticed that a lot of the communications were directed to and from a cia case officer by the name of howard and so uh i asked around trying to figure out who was howard because if he was responsible for handling this group in 1963 which had repeated contact with oswald in new orleans in 1963 the cuban students challenged oswald for his pro-castro politics they got into a

00:12:00 (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=s1ecxFsP2HA&t=720s>)

his pro-castro politics they got into a fight with him they sent out a press release about him they challenged him to a debate on the radio they sent out a press release about that they made a tape of the debate about the radio all of which came in very handy three months later when the president was shot and killed and oswald was arrested at that point the cia's assets in the amspel program had a world-class scoop on their hands they knew all about the man who had allegedly killed the president so i wanted to know who was the cia case officer running this operation that would be a person who would know a lot about the assassination and so i wanted to find out who that was they were still alive interview them if they weren't figure out who they were and figure out you know what they might have known cia officers are required to report quite diligently and thoroughly and are graded on the thoroughness and the diligence of their reporting so if this man had sponsored a group that had contact with the man who killed the president then he that's something that he would of course be expected to report to not report it would be an egregious breach of duty so i went after this story and it turned out to be kind of difficult to find out um you know who he was so i turned to the to the jfk review board in 1997 and i asked them to ask the cia who was howard and so the review board did that they put the question to ci who was this group's case officer and the answer came back from the cia we have no records of anyone named howard we think that it was just a routing indicator that was the language that the the explanation that the cia gave to the jfk review board that the name howard that appeared on the

documents didn't actually refer to a person it was a routing indicator now i don't know what a routing indicator is but i had spoken to the guys in miami who worked with him they didn't know his real name but they were young men then

00:14:01 (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=s1ecxFsP2HA&t=841s>)

real name but they were young men then and they dealt with him and they described him to me and a well-dressed man mediterranean features kind of swarthy very well spoken probably a lawyer maybe from new york you know very detailed description so you know and right down to his pinky ring and so a routing indicator you know i i never met a routing indicator that had a pinky ring and it turned out that that was a cover story and the review board did their own investigations and they found that howard referred to a man named george joe nedes and the report released a handful of records at the time at the time of my inquiry about five ten pages of records about joe and edie's the review board didn't really have time to investigate anymore and they didn't really know who he was because it was only when we saw these records that we understood how important he was he had a very sensitive job he was the chief of covert action the chief of psychological warfare in the miami station in 1963 and he reported directly to deputy director richard helms this was clear from the from the fitness evaluations that we showed but the information had one other thing that was really quite startling um and that was that not only had john edie's been involved or close in proximity to the jfk story in 1963 he had returned to the story in 1978 and this was the real revelation to me 15 years later this man george joe nedes became the cia liaison to the house select committee on assassinations that is he's the point of contact the committee's investigators would ask for records from the cia it was johnny's job to go get them from agency files and turn them over or to arrange wit to arrange interviews with retired cia people so he was the liaison well the whole time that he was that liaison

00:16:00 (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=s1ecxFsP2HA&t=960s>)

time that he was that liaison the investigators for the house select committee on assassinations were never told that he had been involved in the events of 1963 that he had been running the cuban students who knew who were the first to publicize oswald's activities both before and after the assassination so that really raised the stakes in the question of who this man was i did some searching unfortunately he had died he had died in 1991 he'd never been questioned by any assassination investigators so i eventually sued for his records and that's the story that i tell in morley vcia i sued under the freedom of information act in 2003 with the help of a excellent veteran freedom of information act litigator here in washington named jim lasar who has represented lots of journalists and lots of jfk authors as well and so we spent 16 years uh i mean i knew it was going to take a long time i didn't think it was going to take 16 years but what we did was stew for the records and the cia gave us a few records within a year and told us to go away and so we appealed and said that the cia had not complied with the law um and jim lassara's argument in that regard was very effective and we won on appeal and we want about 500 pages more of material that the cia was forced to disclose and it was here that we really began to understand more about the importance of georgia joeniti's story um a couple of things uh there were some travel records which showed that joey's had a residence in new orleans he was stationed in miami and he his he and his family lived in miami but this paperwork showed that he had a a residence and it was on there it said home residence new orleans so joe needs based in miami his agents have contact with oswald in miami and it turns out he actually must have spent some time in

00:18:00 (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=s1ecxFsP2HA&t=1080s>)

he actually must have spent some time in miami if he had a residence there we didn't learn any more anymore about it but we did establish that he had a presence in miami during his tenure as covert action chief in miami given oswald's presence in new orleans that was a significant that was a a a very significant finding um joining us uh we learned also from from these records that joe anders had been given a medal for his uh at the end of his career which praised him for uh among other things his performance in the domestic field well the only time joe and eddie's was in the domestic field um was when he was in miami so he was being praised for this time we also learned from those records that he had completely deceived the

hsca in their investigation one of the questions that the hsca had was well so who was the case officer for this group in 1963 it was the same question that i asked 20 years later who was in charge of this group the hsc investigator dan hardway went to the cia liaison uh george join 80s and asked for the records now the answer to the question john 80s had the answer to the question he was the guy but instead of answering the question he said i'll get back to you and he never provided the information so he also he stonewalled the house select communion assassinations in a very audacious way and bob blakey the the general counsel for the hsca the man who ran the investigation um was furious when he discovered this when i when i discovered that to him and he he really felt that he had been betrayed by the agency and before that blakey had always said that the agency had cooperated with his investigation and after the revelation of joe and edie's he he revoked that and he said he no longer trusted the cia and that they had compromised his investigation they had not cooperated with it so this was the story

00:20:01 (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=s1ecxFsP2HA&t=1201s>)

cooperated with it so this was the story that that we pursued through through the federal courts and uh i'm not gonna i'm not gonna spoil the ending but we we we stuck at it and at the end of the day we came to a final confrontation with the man who would become famous uh brett kavanaugh brett kavanaugh issued the decisive ruling in the case of morley vcia and what and his decision was very emblematic of how the national security state treats the kennedy assassination and in his decision kavanagh said that the cia deserves deference upon deference that was a quotation that he cited and that is the attitude um of the national security agencies uh the attitude of the courts about the national security agencies in the jfk story even on this story where public interest remains so high after many years um the courts still side with the secret agencies against the public interest and that is really you know what i learned the hard way we learned some interesting and valuable information about the manipulation and monitoring of oswald through the lawsuit but we were stopped you know we were able to identify records that we never saw about joining's actions in 1962 and 1963 about his cover about his intelligence methods and those records remain secret so my book is kind of the prelude the unfinished investigation you know where where does the investigation go from here well i think it goes to those records i didn't get and we do know that those records exist because when you do a freedom of information act lawsuit um even if the government doesn't give you the records they are still obliged under the law under the act to provide what's called a vaughan index and they need to identify the documents that they didn't give you so you don't get to see the

00:22:01 (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=s1ecxFsP2HA&t=1321s>)

give you so you don't get to see the document but you do know what that it exists and usually they'll give you a little bit of information about it page number of pages type of document that sort of thing well i identified at the end of the day 44 documents that the cia has on george joe needings that were generated in 1962 and 1963 or in 1978 79 when he was the liaison to the hsca that are secret in their entirety now why does this matter well the last of the jfk records are up for review again this year um four years ago the the implementation of the jfk records that fell to president trump and after some hopeful signs some of us hope that he would do the right thing he succumbed to the pressure of the cia and allowed them to keep these records and thousands more fifteen thousand plus records secret um for another four years so later this year joe biden's gonna have to decide what to do about the last of the jfk records and the records that i saw i'm hoping will be in there and i'm hoping the president will make the you know do the make do the right thing and release these records there's no real reason to keep them secret anymore um except to spare the agency uh embarrassment and that's not a reason that's good enough under the law the law says all these records should be made public what's in those records well you know this is a this is a tough thing for me because i don't know what's in the records and i don't like to speculate because i could be wrong and uh but given that the records are out of reach right now you know what do they tell us what do i think is in there what what's the unfinished part of my investigation i think that what those records will show what those 44 records will show was that oswald and the fair play for cuba committee were targeted in early 1963

00:24:00 (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=s1ecxFsP2HA&t=1440s>)

targeted in early 1963 probably as early as january 1963 for harassment disruption uh it it was probably the fair play for cuba committee when oswald became involved in it i don't know but i think that the the use of the amspel program which joe andes was in charge of to create a negative public image for the fair play for cubic committee i think that assignment originated in early 1963. and there's a whole bunch of documents about joey needy's cover uh he might not he might have been undercover of another agency the customs or um army intelligence uh he had worked under military cover in other uh in other assignments um so we don't know but i think that that's where this assignment to target the fair play for community cuba committee and lee oswald in august 1963 it takes shape then and then joe needs we know from the existing from the records we do have becomes the chief of psychological warfare branch covert action branch of the miami station on august 1st 1963 and oswald's encounters confrontation with the cuban student directorate begin within a week so you know there may not be a connection there but there may be and the documents that i'm seeking the unfinished part of my investigation would be to clarify that what was going on here and maybe there is no connection maybe i maybe my speculation is wrong if so there will be nothing in the file that would be incriminating or uh to the cia and you would think that they would want to release it given that the information is you know close to 60 years old you know i don't think that's going to happen because i think the information's too embarrassing but with the president reviewing jfk records this year you know there's a shot it's possible um that we could get at these records so that's a very narrow slice of what may

00:26:01 (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=s1ecxFsP2HA&t=1561s>)

that's a very narrow slice of what may happen this year but that's the story of my lawsuit and what happens when you really try and really try and get new information related to the kennedy assassination it's very difficult you know and the courts make it very difficult and i think my book is morley versus cia it's interesting because you really see that process and you hear the judges talking you hear the way the judges talk about jfk records in a way that is you know quite different than the kind of media internet discourse which is all about you know conspiracy and all of that and doesn't really interest me what's interesting about my case is it's about how the government really worked in 1963 and about how it really works today there's nothing theoretical about it this is the national security state in action so that's kind of the key background to the jfk assassination um and also why i think it matters this year so i think i'm just going to leave it at that i think that you know that's my story i urge you to get the get the book it'll only cost you 99 cents it's a good read um there's a lot of interesting characters in it like the story of george joe nedes also how brett kavanaugh came to be involved in the case and then also some cameos from long-time jfk and investigators who really have had a kind of almost heroic role in in my view jim lazar my lawyer who we won multiple rounds multiple rounds in federal court with just one lawyer jim massar and his co-counsel dan alcorn and we would go up against these teams of lawyers from the justice department and it would be just us at our little table you know and we'd look over the way and at the government table there'd be like six attorneys there you know some from ceia some from justice department these are all you know they're all making six figure salaries they all have nothing to do but you know just this you know you really felt the force

00:28:02 (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=s1ecxFsP2HA&t=1682s>)

know you really felt the force in that courtroom i really felt the force of the national security state they were they were turning out the soldiers to make sure that you know i didn't think that i was going to have any chance to prevail so i saw the national security state kind of up close its enforcement apparatus and that was interesting to feel it in a kind of a visceral and and personal way so um that's the story i think that i'd like to you know take questions and maybe i can flesh out more what the story is and where i think the story's going so let me pause there and let's talk about it okay great jeff let me start out with a couple questions from the host prerogative here so i'm curious as to what the when you when you went into court to make these arguments for the release of these records what exactly was the argument of the cia as to why they should not be forced to release these and what was the reasoning of the court uh with respect to the release of these documents that's my first question okay so so one one problem that we had is the records that were released by the jfk review board were released under the criteria the standards of the jfk records act which was passed in 1992 and was really a very strong law it's much stronger than the freedom of information act

but there's no grounds for action written into the jfk records act so you have to sue under the freedom of information act which is a much weaker law and which has been amended at the behest of the agency to protect them even more so uh you know so the argument well um we want to see the records of joe and edie's operations in the summer of 1963 and we said look you know congress says all these records should be made public you know that's the intent of congress and they said well no we don't care about that law and the freedom of

00:30:00 (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=s1ecxFsP2HA&t=1800s>)

about that law and the freedom of information act we don't have to disclose operational records so so from the get-go we never saw what was joe andes actually doing in his secret activities in the summer of uh and fall of 1963 so that was kind of ruled out from the start once we got in court i mean what they do is is they they throw every argument in the book at you and so um they have the right under the law to request exemptions under certain categories of information so there's a national security category which the courts never challenge so with certain records we want we wanted to see and they would say you know that's national security material you can't see it and so even even in the documents that we did get there are substantial redactions on those grounds there's some privacy arguments although joining us has been dead for since 30 years um uh but that was another uh argument that they used most perniciously though you know they came back and they would argue things like this and this is where you really feel kind of the viciousness of it right they would say um you know morley's just filing these records um so that he can get the government to pay his copying costs you know uh morley is out for commercial gain in uh in this thing and it was really it was really it was completely wrong you know we were doing this on our own dime and we would not gonna make any money off of it but you know they impugn you not only do they deny you the information but then they also impugn you in court they impugn your motives to suggest that you know this isn't worth the court's time so though you know the the arguments then get you know very technical about well can you release you know the administ one exemption is about sort of organizational structure and so they can withhold the name of you know a cia office or

00:32:02 (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=s1ecxFsP2HA&t=1922s>)

you know a cia office or and so we got a lot of that as well um fortunately in that first round when we won the appellate court was very strong and they said you know you have not complied with the law and that was the that was a key ruling because we won additional a lot of additional material we want we for example we got the first picture ever of joe and edie's receiving that medal um uh we got uh we got this we got the story of his tenure at the at the hsca um so we got a lot but they constantly wore us down and what they and then what they said one phase of the litigation was um typically if you win on appeal right if you prove that the government didn't comply with the law the first time around typically not always the government will pay your court costs it's kind of to encourage the government to obey the law because if they don't they'll have to pay out of pocket the government fought us tooth and nail on that because they didn't want to admit that we had found something significant in the files which we clearly had and we demonstrated that we had because the new york times covered the story and fox news covered the story and ap covered the story you know it was a genuinely legitimate story all major news organizations you know realized that but the courts didn't do that i never forget we were sitting in court and we had submitted a package of these press clips and it was like 30 news stories around the country in major news sites as an example of that there was public interest in here and therefore you know the government should cover my court costs and pay for the fact that they were recalcitrant and didn't turn over the records the first time and uh i know brett kavanaugh read those because i saw him flipping through the package as he was listening to the arguments you know and he never mentions it in in his in any of his rulings so the the attitude of the judges and of

00:34:00 (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=s1ecxFsP2HA&t=2040s>)

the the attitude of the judges and of the of the lawyers is you know you really don't have the right to ask for this and they were knowing they were annoyed and we even had a meeting one time with the with the cia people and you know they were like you know giving me the dead eye they were extremely hostile in person to factual questions about george jones so you know they were bristling and ready to fight all right well let me i'm going to we got a lot of questions coming in so i'm going to defer my second question to the end and maybe somebody will cover it let me start with the questions uh charlie says as you dealt with the cia in the courts did you get any sense as to where they stood personally regarding jfk they shut you down but did you any emotional relationship with them with respect to jfk you know i it's a good question in that meeting that i just alluded to face to face being the first one that i had i got the feeling that they were offended that anybody was asking for jfk related records there was no there was zero interest in like you know can we clarify the record you know can we fulfill the spirit of the freedom of information act no it was you're not going to get anything from us you know and you're not even going to get like a handshake from us that was the attitude yeah standard arrogance of uh the national security establishment they're in control and we're we're the serfs or the peons yeah um if not for the the cats and okay this is from uh joshua it's not for the katzenbach memo which uh stated that the u.s government's position was that oswald acted alone do you think the caa and the u.s military would have asserted that oswald acted on behalf of cuba and or the soviet union uh you know i i think they were waiting

00:36:01 (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=s1ecxFsP2HA&t=2161s>)

uh you know i i think they were waiting to see what happened i mean you see a concerted effort by cia assets starting within hours of the assassination to lay the blame on cuba and that's the cuban student directorate led that effort and all of the stories in the american newspapers the next day were based on information that came from this cia front group so you see this initial effort but when johnson and hoover two days after the assassination put out the word as hoover said you know we have to find that oswald was the real assassin and we have to convince the public and captain back says the same thing so white house and fbi get on the same page at that point the cia abandoned the cia assets abandoned an effort to blame the assassination on cuba and quickly settle on this one guy did it alone for no reason and so within 48 hours the the cia leadership moves from a position of maybe we can blame this on castro to we're not going to investigate oswald's guilty and leave us alone and so uh i think that if oswald had not been captured alive um there might have been a much more vigorous effort to blame the assassination one if if the scheme or the plan of the people who assassinate the president was to blame the crime on cuba the fact that oswald denied he was responsible was a big you know problem it was a huge problem and so you know the idea the idea of blaming cuba at that point kind of fell apart and then when oswald was killed you know all bets were off because everybody said there must be some monkey business going on here and i should say i've said this before to you jacob but i think i always emphasize this to the audience you know national polling organizations did polls within a week of kennedy's assassination and they asked people

00:38:00 (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=s1ecxFsP2HA&t=2280s>)

and they asked people so the president was dead oswald was dead what did people think had happened and every poll that was taken that week showed about two-thirds of the people thought that more more than oswald was involved so and at that time there were no jfk conspiracy theorists to the contrary the white house the fbi the dallas police were all saying this one guy did it pay no attention we're sorry it's over um and yet two-thirds of the people still believe there was a conspiracy so the fear of conspiracy did not originate with conspiracy theorists it originated in the facts of the crime okay um bob asks well bob uh is asking a question that relates to the second question i was going to ask you so i'll expand on it he says hi jeff loved our men in mexico your book regarding joe anita's thoughts on how in both major investigations the warren commission and the house select committee the cia had a gatekeeper in the liaison role dulles in the first case and of course joe anitas and my question is can you go a little bit into what the the misleading role that joe anitas had as the liaison when he actually turned out to be a big obstructor with respect to dan hardway and and lopez on their investigation of the cia right well i mean as the liaison and he was in the position to you know to cut off their life letter to cut off any to not answer any questions he didn't want to answer and he

clearly did not want to answer that question who was the case officer for the cuban student director i i think the only rational explanation for that stance is that he could not release he could not disclose his operation his the details of his operations that year in 1963 because they related to the assassination i mean they did relate to

00:40:01 (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=s1ecxFsP2HA&t=2401s>)

assassination i mean they did relate to the assassination it was his guys who were publicizing oswald's procastro politics so that to me the fact that he never came forward indicates to me that he was witting to an operation implicated you know targeting oswald and in 63 and then in 1978 he was took the lead in making sure that the hsca and dan hardway and bob blakey never learned that he was in miami in 1963 much less the nature of his operations with the dre m spell group so as the as the liaison i mean and this is what both um uh blakey and hardway have said you know he was really in a position to keep them from getting to anything that he didn't want them to see and this story of what was going on with the oswald and spell contacts you know seems to have been joe nedes was certainly acting like it was an authorized cia operation well and i recall also that judge tunnum who was the chairman of the assassination records of your board board that he was upset when he learned that of joe anderson's role that yeah no um so he said joanita should have been a witness here yeah yeah um i the review board when i i said you know who is howard see if you can find out they went and the cia didn't give them the answer and they had their were able to do their own investigation and they got the answer and they put out about 10 pages of records but and then i was able to write about so who was this guy and what was he doing and when 29 read that he was like you know even when we answered the question we really had no idea who he was if the review board had gone out of existence by that time so they couldn't go back but he said if we had been in existence we would have gone back gotten all of his records and declassified

00:42:00 (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=s1ecxFsP2HA&t=2520s>)

declassified everything because he was in such a central role both in 63 and in 78. okay christopher says in your opinion how much has the cia grown in influence in american governmental politics since the kennedy assassination if it has grown why has it been so difficult to rein them in for subsequent presidents um i think that i mean i think what the kennedy assassination did was consolidate the cia's position i think that the cia was very strong and in some ways stronger in the 50s because it had unquestioned public and congressional support there was no opposition to the cia in in that regard and its image public image was among the general public was was pretty good people you know were favorably disposed with it by not being held accountable for the kennedy assassination the cia gained a tremendous degree of impunity and and we saw that impunity in the watergate scandal years later i mean within 10 years people began to realize how much secret power they had and how they had abused it so the cia's power to answer christopher's question is it has grown since since uh since 1963 its position in the american you know national security state was solidified um and that was a close thing you know there were a lot of doubts about the cia's rule and the assassination most prominently from former president harry truman the man who signed the cia into existence and as a result of the assassination president former president truman wrote an editorial calling within a month calling for the abolition of the clandestine service the the operational portion of the cia a remarkably bold statement you know and clearly

00:44:00 (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=s1ecxFsP2HA&t=2640s>)

bold statement you know and clearly provoked by the kennedy assassination so harry truman a man who knew how u.s government worked a man who worried about creating the cia in the first place he worried about creating an american gestapo he said that was a phrase he used and after kennedy's assassination all of those doubts that he had were revived again so nobody listened to truman at that point and the cia continued to grow the cia's abuses of power were exposed in the 70s and somewhat curbed or brought into a little more regular uh a little more government regulation but the kennedy assassination consolidated the power of the cia and the american power scheme and you know i think that you know to the point why is it so

hard for other presidents to undo well you know it's that's impunity for you and you know if that's why they still fight the release of these jfk records because that you know they feel that they can do it and they don't want to talk about their past and and and and have questions raised about it so they are and they are in a very strong position and my book shows one other thing that's been added to their power which is probably greater than in 1963 which is now they have the blessing of the courts they have a lot of case law which says you know the public the congress have to defer to these national security agencies and their business so that also ensures their strength and that's why uh you know if presidents have the desire to uh you know reduce their power um it's very difficult for them well it's reflected by their power of assassination i mean back in the 50s and 60s they would keep their assassination secret and covert now they have a formalized policy of assassination and the courts have said we're not going to get involved in it including if they assassinate an american citizen yeah so that that's pretty powerful um also i think autumn you mentioned truman that truman wrote that op-ed in the washington post 30 days

00:46:00 (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=s1ecxFsP2HA&t=2760s>)

op-ed in the washington post 30 days after the assassination oh okay yeah that okay that couldn't have been a coincidence i don't think no it wasn't it wasn't okay okay uh bob says do you have a take on whether there was someone resembling oswald deliberately impersonating him to create the cuban soviet ties legend there's pretty strong evidence that somebody impersonated oswald on the phone when he was in mexico city um and uh um and there you know multiple people who said that including j edgar hoover after hearing a tape said the man's voice on the tape was not the oswald who was in custody in dallas so um there was yes i think oswald was impersonated whether he was impersonated in person i i don't think there's i think there's less evidence of that there's talk of that but i don't see any strong evidence for being impersonated on the phone the evidence is pretty strong that's that somebody faked a phone call in his name and that's you know that's almost you know prima facie evidence of an operation okay charles has an interesting question that do you know who joe anita's supervisor or manager was in the cia yes um joe needs was named to that position as the case officer by the chemistry director by deputy director richard helms um so who uh told the dre leaders in november 1962 that he was going to give a new case officer who would report directly to him and we have the transcript of helms's conversation with the cuban students in which he says that the new case officer will report directly to him so he names joe andes now one of the things that we saw in the lawsuit was his reporting a case officer like joe neddes handling

00:48:00 (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=s1ecxFsP2HA&t=2880s>)

nedes handling a group like the cuban student director has to file a monthly report called a monthly progress report what's the group doing with the us government's money you know are they fulfilling the cia's purposes or not and so every month you write down how you spent the money and what you got for it and we should do it next year and is it all going to work out and that sort of thing so i was sought the records joe needy's reporting on the cuban student directorate all of those reports could not be found or were denied to me the cia denies that they existed the problem with it with their denial that they existed is that it was supported by a lie they said the reason that there's no reports is because the cia didn't have a relationship with the cuban student directorate after april 1963. well that was a lie and we know it's a lie because in 2017 they released more records from the am spell file and they showed that the cia's relationship continued with the the dre uh up until 1966. so their denial that for the reason that there's no reports is because there was no relationship doesn't hold any water there was a relationship which raises the question well where are the files so i think what happened to answer the question is joe and eddie's did not report in the normal way the normal way would be for jonathan to report to the station chief right he runs a branch within the cia's office in miami the branch responsible for psychological warfare and normally he would report to the station chief who would then report to headquarters i think joe anders probably reported directly to headquarters and we don't know it was probably somebody designated by him so that alone tells you that it was an unusual and tightly held relationship so you know who was running joe needs i mean it was somebody reporting to dick helms and it might have been helms himself right now

[00:50:01 \(<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=s1ecxFsP2HA&t=3001s>\)](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=s1ecxFsP2HA&t=3001s)

might have been helms himself right now do we know when jonita started working for the cia and what his activities might have been before yeah yeah so one of the things that we obtained was um in the lawsuit was pretty full biography he was a career cia officer he had joined um in 1951 on a contract he became a full-time undercover officer about in 1956 or 57 and worked in the athens station um jones was uh born in the united states but of greek parents spoke fluent french and greek so he worked in the athens station he was transferred from the athens station to miami in the spring of 1962 at the behest of um at the behest of helms and probably at the behest of helms's deputy a man named tom cara messiness and tom cara messiness was one of the senior greek americans in the cia at the time and he kind of had a generation of officers of greek american case officers who who he brought into the agency and eight i i i don't have direct evidence but i'm pretty sure that joe andes was one of his kind of you know promising excellent case officers and that's why they brought him to miami because they found him very trustworthy so the chain of command is a little is a little um uh difficult to see and i one reason why i mentioned those records that i didn't get i think they would shed light on exactly this question who was he reporting to because that is a key question john edes was not he was no rogue operator he would he was a very meticulous guy known for steady loyal service he would never have acted on his own he was reporting to somebody and doing somebody's bidding and who that person was or persons the people who targeted oswald in the fair play for cuba committee that's a key question and

[00:52:00 \(<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=s1ecxFsP2HA&t=3120s>\)](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=s1ecxFsP2HA&t=3120s)

cuba committee that's a key question and we don't have the answer okay charlie says is there a regulation or law that states how long the jfk related records must be kept or is there a point in time when the shredding machines can move in well the jfk records act passed in 1992 ordered all government agencies to identify any records that were assassination related and they created an independent board the assassination records review board to go in and obtain these records and to review them and release them so under the terms of the law the review board did that and collected a huge body of records and made a lot of it public and did great work as you'll hear from doug horn next week they were you know instrumental in bringing a lot of things to the fore the the terms of the law said that after 25 years all of the assassination related records that had been collected and reviewed should be made public in their entirety so that was the sunset of the law um any no records in the jfk collection can be destroyed um uh period uh so we we have that collection of records now it's still not complete it's still not completely open there's fifteen thousand records still missing and there's key records like the jonetti's files that are still withheld but that's where that's the body of records we're working with there's also a law that says government records have to be made public after 50 years but the cia has an exception uh to that and they use that loophole to deny even things that are more than a half century old so um you know i hear a lot of arguments when i talk about these records and there's two arguments that that i hear and one is oh there's nothing in there the government destroyed everything a long time ago and the argument is oh there's nothing in there we know

[00:54:00 \(<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=s1ecxFsP2HA&t=3240s>\)](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=s1ecxFsP2HA&t=3240s)

in there we know one man alone and unaided killed the president for no reason so there's nothing relevant left to say so you know i hear those two arguments a lot and i just think if either of them were actually true we would not be in the situation we're in so if it were true that the government destroyed everything a long time ago and you know there's no use in looking well we've learned a tremendous amount from the jfk review board there was a lot that the government never shredded that reflects very poorly and undermines the official story at every turn so it wasn't true that the cia shredded everything a long time though historically that has not been true every round of disclosure has resulted in important information coming out now there may be less now than there was before you know we're dealing with a much smaller group of records but i don't accept the argument that oh it was all created a long time ago nor do i accept the argument that there's you know there's nothing in there because we know that one man alone and donated killed the president for no reason every round of disclosure has undermined that argument so i don't find either of

those arguments valid in terms of the jfk records i think there's still records out there that you know are important and we need to get our hands on that's not to say that key records haven't been destroyed we know that that has happened also but that was you know an illicit process i'm talking about the legal process where the records are supposed to come out well i know that if if i had done something wrong jeff and there were tons of records that were pointing in that direction the ones i would want to keep hidden to the very last would be the most incriminating ones i mean you know as a journalist i mean that has to be your working supposition i mean why are they keeping it secret i mean they're not they're not keeping secrets for no reason i mean the cia does keep secrets instinctively and if we look at this body of records that is still secret we can see things that are ridiculous

00:56:02 (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=s1ecxFsP2HA&t=3362s>)

we can see things that are ridiculous like i came across one today in a document about bill harvey in 1963 it says chief you know chief of station comma and it's blanked out okay we know what's under that redaction rome it's been on the public record for years the cia has in other contexts had no objection to the publication of that information so they just do that to prove that they can prevail and and make you fight them and take up your time you know with a ridiculous over classification a lot of what's going on is ridiculous over classification but that's not to say that there's not a kernel of important information in that haystack of trivial information right okay jay asked is there any indication that john edis ran oswald in new orleans you know good question good question uh is there any evidence no i mean we know he had a residence there and you know i think it's possible that that he that he might have been the person to have contact with oswald uh but you know that would be purely speculative and i have to say there's no evidence there is evidence that he uh we know he was running the m spell operation in 1963 we know he went to new orleans in 1963 and we know oswald was in new orleans having contact with the m spell assets in 1963. that's about as tight as you can draw the circle you can't really say anything definitive about that i would just say it's possible and i and the fact that as i said before you know that they're hiding lots of information about joe and eddie's cover and intelligence methods in 1963 is another thing that makes me think your speculation might be right because those things are still very sensitive 58 years later

00:58:00 (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=s1ecxFsP2HA&t=3480s>)

okay well i'm having a glitch with my zoom program because i keep starting my video and it keeps shutting down so i as long as people can hear me that's okay uh but they you won't be able to see me okay michael asks when did the dre first fall out with castro um so castro came to power on january 1st 1959 and um uh in 1959 um you know this was not a um this was not a castro's coming to power was not a brutal takeover by any means he came to power universally acclaimed um by you know tossing out an unpopular and corrupt dictator so in 1959 the cuban revolution was cuba was in a state of flux and contact and castro was was you know cleverly playing for time um but in 1959 and 1960 the fallout begins and really the turning point is in 1960 february 1960 anastas mikoyan uh a soviet diplomat not their foreign minister but kind of a deputy foreign minister came to havana and this was a sign that castro was turning to the soviet union for help and and protection from the united states and the the leaders of the of what became the cuban student directorate that's when they mounted a protest and they had a protest in the parque central in havana to protest mikoyan's visit they were anti-communist students um and uh they were attacked by a mob of castro supporters it was kind of a you know big brawl almost a riot in the parque central and those students were then expelled from the university of havana and that's when they came to miami so it was in the summer of 1960 where those students opposed to castro felt

01:00:00 (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=s1ecxFsP2HA&t=3600s>)

those students opposed to castro felt they had to leave the country they came to miami and when they got there because they were young and enthusiastic and well organized and you know determined to take on castro the cia started funding them so that was august 1960 was when the funding relationship began and we now know that it continued through 1966. okay jim asks some people of course suggest that oswald was

involved in the fair play for cuba committee as an agent provocateur connected to guy bannister the retired fbi agent there in the intelligence area in new orleans and jim's asking are you implying that oswald was a genuine communist and then he follows it up with what about oswald slip in his radio debate when he said that while in moscow he was under the protection of the u.s government and then quickly stopped and corrected himself you know i mean um i i i think that this the oswald am spell contacts i mean we can there's two possibilities one they were coincidental the other possibility is that somebody wanted that to happen and i think given that this is cia activity i think somebody wanted it to happen and that somebody was whoever george joe andes was reporting to so we don't know where the chain of command goes we know it goes up from jones towards headquarters in terms of what's going on in in dallas i think that yeah oswald is acting like a provocateur the cia had an fbi had the fair play for cuba committee well penetrated the executive director was a cia informant for example the accountant was an fbi informant so they were in a position to act in the name of the fair play for cuba committee and that's a that's a classic cointelpro tactic is you take over an organization and you act in its name and you do embarrassing things and there's nothing they can do

01:02:01 (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=s1ecxFsP2HA&t=3721s>)

there's nothing they can do you know to protect themselves because you are you have assumed their identity and that seems to have been what happened in 1963 in august 1963. now there's no contradiction was oswald a genuine leftist i mean he talked leftist politics to a lot of people that doesn't mean that his approach to the fair play for cuba committee was based on sincere leftism i think it was based on uh an idea of intrigue and uh oswald was an adventurer well traveled spoke russian and you know like to do things and make things happen so i think that the agency exploited his genuine leftism you know for its own ends um which was to embarrass and destroy the fair play cuba committee and that in fact is what happened a month after the assassination the fair play for cuba committee disbanded a group that had 40 chapters on u.s college campuses disbanded because of the taint of oswald on its name so that was and i think that this is why joe and eddie's medal is important i think joey's got a medal for helping to destroy the fair play from cubica well and then there's that that unusual incident where where oswald's out there handing out pamphlets in favor of the fair play for cuba committee with the return address which is the site entrance guy banister's office yeah i know and so and so that's there yeah um and the the question is good because it does go back you know oswald was seen in that building he was seen in the presence of of guy banister um and and and and this was known to federal agents in new orleans and when the church committee invest investigated the assassination this is some documents that have emerged in recent years there were a couple of guys from the immigration naturalization service who worked in that area downtown dallas and they

01:04:02 (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=s1ecxFsP2HA&t=3842s>)

in that area downtown dallas and they said yeah you know we have been keeping an eye on that on that on that group of banister and ferry and oswald was one of them that's what the the guy from ins said he said i've been waiting for years to talk about this and the church committee never followed up they never interviewed that again at least we have no we have no record that they ever interviewed him okay james asks before your discovery of george joe anitas it was assumed and written that david phillips cia agent officer controlled the dre did phillips and joe nedis work together on controlling the dre it worked like this david phillips was stationed in havana uh in the um mid 1956 1957 he got another assignment went overseas he came back they put him back into cuba in 1960 um when the cuban when those when the cuban students um protested the mikoyan visit that's when phillips recruited them and when they came to miami um he gave them money and he gave them a case officer a man named ross crozier and so ross crozier handled the group for phillips and then in november 1962 helms intervened took they replaced crozier with joe anita so phillips was always kind of the godfather of the dre but he always had a he always had a case officer who would be handling them on a you know on a regular basis phillips had a lot larger responsibilities by 1963 he was running operations against cuba out of mexico city and he was running according to win scott the station chief probably a dozen different operations so the dre would have only been one of those in which he was handling but philip's responsibility for the dre is pretty clear when when howard hunt was interviewed by the hsca and was asked you know uh who was running the dre he

[01:06:01 \(https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=s1ecxFsP2HA&t=3961s\)](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=s1ecxFsP2HA&t=3961s)

you know uh who was running the dre he said uh that was dave phillips but i believe that's classified so dave phillips's role in the dre was also sensitive um uh joe needs would have been junior to somebody like phillips so phillips surely knew joe anita's at the time he was handling the dre there can't be any doubt about that but we have no record of it which is interesting all right carlos just makes a comment uh it doesn't ask a question but i'll read the comment in case you want to comment it let me i'll first comment though many cuban americans in miami florida have rejected the story that castro had absolutely anything to do with the kennedy assassination even though the story has been heavily pushed among us we believe that castro both lacked the resources to be involved and had too much to lose had to be linked to the assassination well let me just first say that when we move into the medical evidence starting with doug horn's presentation next week and followed by three more presentations by physicians it will be easy to see that there is no possibility whatsoever that either castro or the soviets had anything to do with this assassination due to the fraudulent nature of the autopsy uh do you want to comment on that or should we yeah no i i mean you know the dre was the dre published the first jfk conspiracy theory to appear anywhere in public print and they were funded by the cia and it was a headline in their newspaper side by side pictures of oswald and castro and the headline was the presumed assassins this was published within 48 hours of of kennedy's death at cia expense so that story has been there from the beginning um it's been pushed very heavily there's not much evidence to support it i mean oswald did have contact with people in mexico city who would be presumed cuban intelligence agents but if you look at the whole history of context with intelligence agencies

[01:08:02 \(https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=s1ecxFsP2HA&t=4082s\)](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=s1ecxFsP2HA&t=4082s)

context with intelligence agencies oswald had a hundred times more contact with cia assets than he had with cuban government assets it's not even close so the argument that that that that the castro was behind it it's really more of a rhetorical thing because the other thing that when you when you drill down on the investigations you know the u.s government professed to hate castro they wanted to kill him they wanted to overthrow his government the cia assets were putting out the story that you know kennedy had been killed by a castroid and yet the cia never investigated the possibility they never investigated the possibility that oswal that oswald worked with castro so it seems like while they were their public assets for generating that story privately they never took it seriously if they had they would have investigated and they never investigated it's one of the striking things about about the investigation that that came out in the 1970s and the cia people were asked that repeatedly well you were trying to kill him kennedy gets killed why didn't you investigate him and the answer was uh we don't know you know i mean it's pure blood it's not it's not credible and like carlos says you know people have pushed this story awfully hard and it still gets pushed in the media sometimes and it's just not credible the evidence isn't there to support it that's a fascinating observation jeff okay mike says wasn't helms the cia liaison to the warren commission didn't he personally appoint joe anita as the dre case officer so can we assume he lied about what he knew as well to the warren commission he was not the liaison to the warren commission helms was a very smooth operator and he never put himself in uh in an awkward or vulnerable position certainly not when he was the deputy director um

[01:10:00 \(https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=s1ecxFsP2HA&t=4200s\)](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=s1ecxFsP2HA&t=4200s)

helms did you know control and obstruct the warren commission investigation from his role um the day-to-day business of excuse me the day-to-day business of dealing with the assassin of the foreign commission fell to junior staffers okay charlie asks have all of your freedom of information requests been directed the cia have some been directed to the pentagon and if not to the pentagon why is that uh you know over the years i have come to have a greater appreciation of the pentagon's role in these events i have not done freedom of information act with them because i didn't have um i didn't have a solid lead i mean i should the point is well taken um uh and uh the the question that i have and that that i should pursue in for you is did joe and edis have military cover in 1963 which strikes me as a definite possibility but i'm sorry to say i have not investigated that maybe i will okay uh let me skip a few here uh where may we find kavanaugh's opinion in

your case uh it's reprinted in morley vcia it's the appendix of dcia um along with a dissent from judge karen henderson another senior u.s appellate court judge here in the in the dc circuit who strongly defended my case and i think really eviscerated kavanaugh's arguments so um judge henderson's dissent in the case was great moral victory for me it showed that a a eminent distinguished experienced judge saw the merit of my case

01:12:01 (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=s1ecxFsP2HA&t=4321s>)

saw the merit of my case um and read it side by side with kavanaugh it's a it's a good it's a good read okay dan says i'd like to mention that one of the efforts the truth and reconciliation committee is making is to ensure that the jfk hsc and church committee records get released jeff mentioned that he'd clarify that the trc is still alive the website is americantruthnow.org we're working on other initiatives yeah so the truth and reconciliation committee is a is an effort a group that wants to reopen all of the assassination investigations from the 1960s jfk rfk martin luther king and malcolm x so that's an ambitious agenda um and there yeah like dan says american truth now is their uh url you can find out more about them there okay uh carl says uh skip that uh let's skip that uh sword sinker everyone says that high also mccone testified to lawrence says helen mccone testified to the warren commission they were deposed by dulles about matters that happened during dulles term that's not a question well uh not a question but it's a good point um helms and macon were brought in and dulles who had a huge conflict of interest since the assassination efforts had originated on his tenure as a as director leads to the questioning and the the gist of his questioning was you didn't know anything about this fellow oswald because the state department didn't inform you isn't that right and helms basically says yeah i i don't recall he helps couldn't recall documents that he had read seven weeks earlier that's how it that that's

01:14:01 (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=s1ecxFsP2HA&t=4441s>)

weeks earlier that's how it that that's how important the assassination of the president was to him he forgot about the oswald file within seven weeks um and uh so the the testimony was wholly misleading because we now know that the state department did inform the cia about oswald and about 25 different cables went from the state department to the cia between 1959 and 1963 detailing exactly oswald's dealings with the state department so this the cia's cover story that they didn't know much about oswald before the assassination was just fictional but that session where dulles you know uh does leading questioning for helms and macon that was the first you know big piece of the cover-up because that's when the oswald file kind of vanished from view and nobody ever the warren commission certainly never understood the cia's interest in oswald before the assassination okay well brent gives us a suggestion that will be a wrap-up he says why don't you give jeff a couple of minutes for water and so we're going to give you more than two minutes i'm going to wrap it up now jeff thanks this has been a great presentation a tooth for presentation last week and this week just fantastic thank you very much for having me um i i would say to to anybody wants to be in touch you can direct message me on twitter at jeffersonmorley or you can email me at the website editor jfkfax.org yeah and you can get both of his fff books cia and jfk the secret assassination files and most recently morley versus jfk my unfinished jfk investigation i mean morley versus cia on our website or at amazon you get both of the books at amazon you can get all of the other three books at amazon and i would invite you to visit regularly at jfkfax.org and deepstateblog.org jeff thanks again it's been great thanks for having me

01:16:01 (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=s1ecxFsP2HA&t=4561s>)

it's been great thanks for having me good night yeah now let me remind everybody that next week okay we got doug horn we now move into the medical evidence we're going to have four presentations we've added three more physicians uh independent physicians you've got michael dr michael chesser you've got dave david mantic you've got gary aguilar that are going to follow doug horn my i am very confident that if you all will go through these four speakers you will reach the same conclusion that i and many other people have reached and it the evidence not a theory uh a that the evidence inexorably leads to but one conclusion that

this was a fraudulent autopsy and then you got to ask yourself is there any innocent explanation for a fraudulent autopsy again horn's video is on our website somebody asked where they could find it it's just go to fff.org and you'll find it during the multimedia section it's two hours and 40 minutes or so long it's an excellent presentation if you watch it before instead of just showing up next wednesday you'll get a lot more out of the q a and equally important you'll get a lot more out of the next three physicians that will be talking about the medical evidence horn sort of sets the foundation for the next three talks so with that we'll sign off and jeff thanks again and we look forward to working with you in the future thank you

END